arXiv:1704.02400v1 [quant-ph] 7 Apr 2017

Concentration of quantum states from quantum functional and Talagrand inequalities.

Cambyse Rouzé[1] and Nilanjana Datta[1]

[1]Statistical Laboratory, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB30WB, UK

April 11, 2017

Abstract

Quantum functional inequalities (e.g. the logarithmic Sobolev- and Poincaré inequalities) have found widespread application in the study of the behavior of ergodic quantum Markov semigroups. The classical counterparts of these inequalities are related to each other via a so-called Talagrand inequality of order 2 (T2). The latter inequality relies on the notion of a metric on the set of probability distributions called the Wasserstein distance of order 2. It in turn implies a Talagrand inequality of order 1 (T1). In this paper, we introduce quantum generalizations of T1 and T2, making use of appropriate quantum versions of the Wasserstein distances, one recently defined by Carlen and Maas and the other defined by us. We establish that these inequalities are related to each other, and to the quantum modified logarithmic Sobolev- and Poincaré inequalities, as in the classical case. We also show that these inequalities imply certain concentration-type results for the invariant state of the underlying semigroup.

1 Introduction

Functional and *Talagrand* (or *transportation cost*) *inequalities* constitute a powerful set of mathematical tools which have found applications in various fields of mathematics and theoretical computer science. They are of relevance in the analysis of the mixing time of a classical, continuous time, ergodic Markov chain, which is the time it takes for the chain to come close to its invariant distribution, starting from an arbitrary initial state. They are also used to derive *concentration (of measure) inequalities*, which provide upper bounds on the probability that a random variable, distributed according to a given measure, deviates from its mean (or median) by a given amount (say r). The concentration is said to be *exponential* (resp. *Gaussian*) if this probability decreases exponentially in r (resp. r^2). Concentration inequalities are of fundamental importance in fields as diverse as probability, statistics, convex geometry, functional analysis, statistical physics, and information theory.

There are different methods for deriving concentration inequalities. The *entropy method*, introduced by Ledoux [26], is an information-theoretic method and employs a particular

class of functional inequalities, called the *logarithmic Sobolev inequalities* (or log-Sobolev inequalities, in short). Concentration inequalities can be shown to be fundamentally geometric in nature. An alternative method to derive them, which is due to Marton [31], exploits this fact by working at the level of probability measures on a metric probability space instead of functions, thus bypassing functional inequalities entirely. In this setting, one can introduce so-called *Wasserstein distances* on the set of probability measures, which are relevant for the derivation of concentration inequalities in this geometric framework. A Talagrand (or transportation cost) inequality is an inequality between a Wasserstein distance between two probability distributions and an information-theoretic quantity relating these distributions, namely, their relative entropy (or Kullback-Leibler divergence [11])[1]. Marton [31] showed that a particular Talagrand inequality (denoted by T1 in Figure 1) implies Gaussian concentration. Talagrand inequalities have been used in various areas of mathematics including probability theory, functional analysis, partial differential equations and differential geometry (see [49] and references therein for an exhaustive survey).

Let us briefly introduce some of the relevant classical functional- and Talagrand inequalities in the discrete space setting (see [15]): Consider an ergodic, continuous time, Markov chain on a finite metric space (Ω, d), with unique invariant distribution $\tilde{q}$, transition matrix P, generator $L = (P - \mathbb{I})$ and associated Markov semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0} := (e^{tL})_{t\geq 0}$. The semigroup is said to satisfy a *(modified) logarithmic Sobolev inequality* (denoted as LS1 in Figure 1), with positive constant α_1, if for any other distribution q,

$$2\alpha_1 D(q\|\tilde{q}) \leq I_{\tilde{q}}(q), \tag{LS1}$$

where $D(q\|\tilde{q})$ is the relative entropy between q and $\tilde{q}$, and the quantity $I_{\tilde{q}}(q)$ is the so-called (discrete) Fisher information of q [15]. Diaconis and Saloff-Coste showed in [14] that such an inequality leads to the so-called rapid mixing property of the semigroup:

$$||q_t - \tilde{q}||_1 \leq \sqrt{2D(q_t\|\tilde{q})} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_1 t}\sqrt{D(q\|\tilde{q})}, \tag{1.1}$$

where q_t denotes the evolved distribution at time t, if the intitial distribution of the Markov chain is q.

Similarly, for a given positive integer p, for the above Markov semigroup, a *Talagrand inequality of order p* (or p-Talagrand), with positive constant c_p, is satisfied if for any distribution q,

$$W_p(q, \tilde{q}) \leq \sqrt{2c_p D(q\|\tilde{q})}, \tag{Tp}$$

where $W_p(q, \tilde{q})$ is the so-called Wasserstein distance of order p (or p-Wasserstein distance) on the set of distributions. When a Talagrand inequality of order 1 (denoted as T1 in Figure 1) is satisfied, the invariant distribution $\tilde{q}$ satisfies *Gaussian concentration*: for a random variable X with law $\tilde{q}$, and any k-Lipschitz function[2] $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{q}}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)] \geq r) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2c_1 k^2}\right). \tag{Gauss}$$

[1] This inequality should not be confused with the related notion of Talagrand concentration inequality, see e.g. [27].

[2] with respect to the distance d on Ω.

Moreover, a Talagrand inequality of order 2 (denoted as T2 in Figure 1) implies another kind of functional inequality, namely the *Poincaré inequality* (denoted as P in Figure 1), which in turn implies *exponential concentration*:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{q}}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)] \geq r) \leq 3 \exp\left(-rk\sqrt{\lambda}/2\right), \tag{Exp}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the spectral gap of the generator of the Markov chain. It also yields a weaker form of convergence in the analysis of the mixing time of the Markov chain, than the one provided in (1.1). The relations between the above inequalities is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Chain of classical functional- and Talagrand inequalities and related concentrations. The citations above the arrows refer to the papers in which the implications were proved.

Quantum analogues of log-Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities, as well as their applications to quantum information theory, have recently attracted a lot of attention (see e.g. [36, 6, 47, 34, 24, 48, 12, 23, 35, 13, 3, 8, 7, 22]). In particular, Kastoryano and Temme [24] defined a noncommutative version of the modified log-Sobolev inequality and showed that it implies a Poincaré inequality. More recently, Carlen and Maas defined a *quantum Wasserstein distance of order* 2 in [7, 8]. In [8], they proved that, for a class of quantum Markov semigroups, the modified log-Sobolev inequality holds provided, along geodesics in the space of faithful (i.e. positive definite) states equipped with this metric, the quantum relative entropy (between a state on the geodesic and the invariant state) is convex. An analogue of the Wasserstein distance of order 1 has also been introduced and studied, in the context of noncommutative von Neumann algebras equipped with a tracial state, by Junge and Zeng in [22].

Our contribution In this paper, we define quantum analogues of the Talagrand inequalities or orders 1 and 2 and prove, similarly to the classical setting, the chain of implications given in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Chain of quantum functional- and Talagrand inequalities and related concentrations. The implication LS1 $\implies$ P was proved by Kastoryano and Temme in [24].

Note that the implication LSI⇒T2 was proved in [7] in the case of the fermionic Fokker-Planck semigroup on the Clifford algebra. For the sake of simplicity, we restrict our attention to the case of quantum Markov semigroups defined on the space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators defined on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ in this paper. However, we expect our results to hold for more general cases of quantum evolutions on separable Hilbert spaces.

Layout of the paper In Section 2, we introduce the necessary notations and definitions, including modular operators, quantum Markov semigroups and quantum Wasserstein distances. Quantum Talagrand inequalities are introduced in Section 3 and the relations between them are proved. More precisely, we prove that T2 implies T1 in Theorem 3, that LSI implies T2 in Theorem 4, and that T2 implies P in Theorem 5. In Section 4, we derive two types of quantum concentration inequalities from the Talagrand and Poincaré inequalities, namely Gaussian (Theorem 7) and exponential (Theorem 6) concentration, respectively.

2 Notations and preliminaries

2.1 Operators, states and modular theory

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the algebra of bounded linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{sa}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ the set of self-adjoint operators. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of positive semi-definite operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{P}_+(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ the set of (strictly) positive operators. Further, let $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \operatorname{Tr}\rho = 1\}$ denote the set of density operators (or states) on $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H}) := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{P}_+(\mathcal{H})$ denote the subset of faithful states. We denote the support of an operator A as $\operatorname{supp}(A)$ and the range of a projection operator P as $\operatorname{ran}(P)$. Let $\mathbb{I} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathrm{id} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ the identity map on operators on $\mathcal{H}$. A linear map $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be unital if $\Lambda(\mathbb{I}) = \mathbb{I}$. The operator norm on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as $\|A\|_\infty := \sup_{\psi\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{0\}} \|A\psi\|/\|\psi\|$, and the operator norm for a superoperator $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as $\|\Lambda\|_{\infty\to\infty} := \sup_{A\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \|\Lambda(A)\|_\infty/\|A\|_\infty$. The Hilbert Schmidt inner product between two operators $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as $\langle A, B\rangle_{HS} := \operatorname{Tr}(A^*B)$. Any observable $f \in \mathcal{B}_{sa}(\mathcal{H})$ has a *spectral decomposition* of the form $f = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathrm{sp}(f)} \lambda\, P_\lambda(f)$, where $\mathrm{sp}(f)$ denotes the spectrum of A, and $P_\lambda(f)$ is the projection operator corresponding to the eigenvalue λ. For any interval E of $\mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathbf{1}_E(f)$ the projection $\sum_{\lambda\in E\cap\mathrm{sp}(f)} P_\lambda(f)$ of any self-adjoint operator f. Unless stated otherwise, we adopt the following convention: operators are denoted by Roman letters, and functions by Greek letters. Given two faithful states ρ, σ, the *relative modular operator* $\Delta_{\rho|\sigma}$ is defined as the map

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \Delta_{\rho|\sigma} : & \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) & \to & \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \\ & f & \mapsto & \rho f \sigma^{-1} \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

As a linear operator on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $\Delta_{\rho|\sigma}$ is positive and its spectrum $\mathrm{sp}(\Delta_{\rho|\sigma})$ consists of the ratios of eigenvalues λ/μ, $\lambda \in \mathrm{sp}(\rho)$, $\mu \in \mathrm{sp}(\sigma)$. For any $x \in \mathrm{sp}(\Delta_{\rho|\sigma})$, the corresponding spectral projection is the map

$$\begin{array}{rccc} P_x(\Delta_{\rho|\sigma}) : & \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) & \to & \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \\ & f & \mapsto & \displaystyle\sum_{\lambda\in\mathrm{sp}(\rho),\mu\in\mathrm{sp}(\sigma):\lambda/\mu=x} P_\lambda(\rho) f P_\mu(\sigma). \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

It can be readily verified that $\Delta^s_{\rho|\sigma}(f) = \rho^s f \sigma^s$ for any s in $[0,1]$. In the particular case $\rho = \sigma$, $\Delta_\sigma := \Delta_{\sigma|\sigma}$ is the so-called *modular operator*, defined as

$$\Delta_\sigma(f) := \Delta_{\sigma|\sigma}(f) \equiv \sigma f \sigma^{-1}, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{2.3}$$

The *modular automorphism group* $(\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of a state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as follows

$$\alpha_t(f) := \mathrm{e}^{itH} f \mathrm{e}^{-itH}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $H := -\log\sigma$. Note that $\Delta_\sigma := \alpha_i$.

2.2 Inner products

In what follows, $\langle A, B\rangle_{HS} := \mathrm{Tr}(A^*B)$ denotes the usual Hilbert-Schmidt inner product between two operators $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. An inner product $\langle .,. \rangle$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *compatible* with a state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ if for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = \langle \mathbb{I}, f\rangle$. This notion is useful as it allows to show, analogously to the classical case, that for any completely positive, unital map Λ that is self-adjoint (or symmetric) with respect to an inner product $\langle .,. \rangle$ compatible with $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, σ is invariant with respect to Λ. Indeed, using the fact that Λ is unital, we get:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = \langle \mathbb{I}, f\rangle = \langle \Lambda(\mathbb{I}), f\rangle = \langle \mathbb{I}, \Lambda(f)\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma\Lambda(f)), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{2.5}$$

Semigroups admitting a unique faithful invariant state are called *ergodic* or *primitive*. Given any function $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ and a state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, one can easily check that the following quadratic form defines an inner product:

$$\langle f, g\rangle_{\varphi,\sigma} := \mathrm{Tr}(f^* R_\sigma \circ \varphi(\Delta_\sigma)(g)), \tag{2.6}$$

where $R_\sigma : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the operator of right multiplication by σ. Perhaps the two most commonly used functions φ are $\varphi_1 : t \to 1$ and $\varphi_{1/2} : t \to t^{1/2}$, for which the inner product defined in Equation (2.6) reduces to:

$$\langle f, g\rangle_{\varphi_1,\sigma} = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f^* g) \equiv \langle f, g\rangle_{1,\sigma}, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\langle f, g\rangle_{\varphi_{1/2},\sigma} = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{1/2} f^* \sigma^{1/2} g) \equiv \langle f, g\rangle_{1/2,\sigma}. \tag{2.8}$$

More generally, for $s \in [0,1]$, and $h_s := t \to t^{1-s}$, one defines the following compatible inner product:

$$\langle f, g\rangle_{\varphi_s,\sigma} = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^s f^* \sigma^{1-s} g) \equiv \langle f, g\rangle_{s,\sigma}. \tag{2.9}$$

The case $s = 1/2$ is special because it is the only one for which for any completely positive (CP) map $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, its adjoint $\Lambda^{(*,1/2)}$ with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1/2,\sigma}$, defined as

$$\langle f, \Lambda(g)\rangle_{1/2,\sigma} = \langle \Lambda^{(*,1/2)}(f), g\rangle_{1/2,\sigma}, \tag{2.10}$$

is also CP. Given a function $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ and a state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, a linear map $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, is said to be self-adjoint (or symmetric) with respect to the inner product $\langle .,. \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}$ if

$$\langle \mathcal{L}(f), g\rangle_{\varphi,\sigma} = \langle f, \mathcal{L}(g)\rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}, \qquad f, g \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

It is not in general true that self-adjointness is a notion independent of the inner product chosen. However, the following theorem, for which a proof can be found in [8], gives a sufficient condition for this to be true.

Theorem 1 (see [8] Theorem 2.9)**.** *Let σ be a non-degenerate faithful density matrix, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be any linear map on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then:*

1 *If $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint with respect to the inner product $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$ and adjoint-preserving (i.e. $\mathcal{L}(f^*) = \mathcal{L}(f)^*$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$), then $\mathcal{L}$ commutes with the modular automorphism group of σ:*

$$\alpha_t \circ \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \circ \alpha_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.11}$$

and $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}$, for all functions $\varphi : (0,1) \to (0,1)$.

2 *If $\mathcal{L}$ commutes with the modular automorphism group of σ, and $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}$ for some $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\psi,\sigma}$ for all $\psi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$.*

Remark 1. Obviously, a linear map $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ commutes with the modular automorphism group of a state σ if and only if $\mathcal{L}$ commutes with Δ_σ.

Remark 2. Given a faithful state σ, a linear map $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1/2,\sigma}$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{L}_* = \Gamma_\sigma \circ \mathcal{L} \circ \Gamma_\sigma^{-1}. \tag{2.12}$$

where $\Gamma_\sigma(f) := \sigma^{1/2} f \sigma^{1/2}$. Indeed, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\langle f, \mathcal{L}(g) \rangle_{1/2,\sigma} = \langle \mathcal{L}(f), g \rangle_{1/2,\sigma} \tag{2.13}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{1/2} f^* \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{L}(g)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{L}(f)^* \sigma^{1/2} g) = \mathrm{Tr}(f^* \mathcal{L}_*(\sigma^{1/2} g \sigma^{1/2})). \tag{2.14}$$

2.3 Entropic quantities

A quantum generalization of the Kullback-Leibler divergence is given Umegaki's quantum relative entropy which is defined as follows: for two states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$D(\rho \| \sigma) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{Tr}(\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)) & \text{if} \, \mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\sigma), \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

It is related to another entropic quantity, namely the L^1-relative entropy defined in [24], as follows:

$$D(\rho \| \sigma) = \mathrm{Ent}_{1,\sigma}(\Gamma_\sigma^{-1}(\rho)), \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$\mathrm{Ent}_{1,\sigma}(f) := \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_\sigma(f)(\log(\Gamma_\sigma(f)) - \log \sigma))) - \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_\sigma(f)) \log(\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_\sigma(f))). \tag{2.17}$$

There are various other quantum generalizations of the Kullback Leibler divergence (see e.g. [21] and references therein). In [43], Petz and Ruskai introduced the following generalization, which they called the quantum *maximal divergence*

$$\widehat{D}(\rho \| \sigma) := \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho \, \sigma^{-1/2} \log(\sigma^{-1/2} \rho \, \sigma^{-1/2})). \tag{2.18}$$

In particular, this quantum divergence is maximal among the so-called quantum f-divergences (see [32]): for any $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$,

$$D(\rho \| \sigma) \leq \widehat{D}(\rho \| \sigma). \tag{2.19}$$

2.4 Quantum Dynamical Semigroups

The GKLS form

Given a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, a *quantum Markov semigroup* models the evolution of a memoryless quantum system on $\mathcal{H}$. In the Heisenberg picture, it is given by a one-parameter family $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of quantum operations, i.e. linear, completely positive, unital maps on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying the following properties

- $\Lambda_0 = \mathrm{id}$, where id denotes the identity map;
- $\Lambda_t\Lambda_s = \Lambda_{t+s}$ – semigroup property;
- $\lim_{t\to 0}||\Lambda_t(f) - f||_\infty = 0$ – strong continuity,

The parameter t plays the role of time. Hence, Λ_t results in time evolution over the interval $[0, t]$, and is called a *quantum dynamical map*. By the Russo-Dye theorem (see [39]),

$$\|\Lambda_t\|_{\infty\to\infty} = 1 \tag{2.20}$$

for each $t \geq 0$. For each quantum Markov semigroup there exists a (generally unbounded) operator $\mathcal{L}$ called the *generator*, or *Lindbladian*, of the semigroup, such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda_t = \Lambda_t \circ \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \circ \Lambda_t, \tag{2.21}$$

where the limit in the derivative is taken in the strong or weak sense. Reciprocally, the Hille-Yosida theorem [40] states that one can uniquely associate to a given unbounded operator $\mathcal{L}$ a semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that Equation (2.21) is satisfied under some regularity conditions on the resolvent of $\mathcal{L}$. Formally, one writes $\Lambda_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$. The semigroup property embodies the assumptions of time-homogeneity and Markovianity, since it implies that the time evolution is independent of its history and of the actual time. Quantum dynamical systems provide a generalization of classical Markov chains (in the discrete state space setting) or Markov semigroups associated to a Markov process (in the continuous state space setting), and therefore it is interesting to study questions similar to the ones asked in the classical framework, namely existence and uniqueness of invariant states, detailed balance conditions, convergence towards the invariant state, speed of convergence etc.

A state ρ is said to be an *invariant state* with respect to the semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ if $\Lambda_{t*}(\rho) = \rho$ for all time $t \geq 0$, where Λ_{t*} is the predual of the map Λ_t for each t, or equivalently

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\rho\Lambda_t(f)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho f), \qquad \forall\, f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),\ \forall t \geq 0. \tag{2.22}$$

A quantum Markov semigroup is said to admit a *GKLS* form (after Gorini, Kossakowski, Lindblad and Sudarshan) if its generator can be written as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = i[H, f] - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} L_j^* L_j f - 2L_j^* f L_j + f L_j^* L_j, \tag{2.23}$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is a (discrete or continuous) set of indices, and $H, L_j,\ j \in \mathcal{J}$ are (possibly unbounded) operators on $\mathcal{H}$, with H being self-adjoint. The operator H is the Hamiltonian governing the unitary evolution of the system, whereas the so-called *Lindblad* operators, L_j, govern the dissipative part of the evolution, resulting from the interaction of the system with its environment. In a series of seminal articles (see [16, 30, 9]), Gorini, Kossakowski, Lindblad and Sudarshan proved that any uniformly continuous quantum semigroup acting on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ can be written in this form, and for such semigroups the operators $H, L_j,\ j \in \mathcal{J}$ are bounded. In the context of quantum optics, many more generators associated to semigroups which are not uniformly continuous can also be written in the GKLS form (see e.g. [6, 29]). Equation (2.23) is a quantum generalization of the classical case of continuous time Markov chains, for which it is known that any generator of such chains can be written as

$$L = \lambda(P - \mathbb{I}), \tag{2.24}$$

where $0 \leq P \leq \mathbb{I}$ is the transition matrix of the Markov chain, and λ is a (positive) rate.

Detailed balance

In the classical setting, the detailed balance condition of a Markov chain characterizes the time reversibility of the process. It means that, starting from a given invariant measure, the probability to get in one step to the state i of the chain starting from the state j is equal to the probability to go from i to j. This condition is equivalent to the symmetry of the generator of the Markov chain with respect to the weighted inner product associated to the given invariant state: more precisely let $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a classical continuous time Markov chain on a finite state space $\Omega \cong \{1, \ldots, N\}$, with associated generator L. Then $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies detailed balance with respect to a probability measure π on Ω if:

$$\langle f, L(g)\rangle_\pi = \langle L(f), g\rangle_\pi, \tag{2.25}$$

for any pair of functions $f, g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, where the inner product above is defined as follows:

$$\langle f, g\rangle_\pi = \sum_{x\in\Omega} \pi(x) f(x) g(x). \tag{2.26}$$

This directly implies that the measure π is invariant with respect to the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$. Unlike the classical case, there are infinitely many ways to define a detailed balance condition in the quantum setting, all of which reduce to the classical one in the case of commutative algebras. However, as Theorem 1 seems to suggest, the inner product $\langle ., . \rangle_{1,\sigma}$ has a special significance. Hence, in what follows, we are only concerned with quantum semigroups $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ whose generators are self-adjoint with respect to it. The following theorem states that under this assumption, the generator $\mathcal{L}$ of $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ admits a special GKLS form (first proved in a more general context by Alicki under the assumption that σ has non-degenerate spectrum in [1], see also [25]):

Theorem 2 ([8] Theorem 3.1)**.** *Let $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a quantum Markov semigroup on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and let σ a faithful state. Suppose that the generator $\mathcal{L}$ of $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is self-adjoint with respect to*

$\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$. *Then the generator* $\mathcal{L}$ *of* $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *has the following form:* $\forall f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \left(\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} \tilde{L}_j^* [f, \tilde{L}_j] + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2} [\tilde{L}_j, f] \tilde{L}_j^* \right) \tag{2.27}$$

$$= \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} \left(\tilde{L}_j^* [f, \tilde{L}_j] + [\tilde{L}_j^*, f] \tilde{L}_j \right) \tag{2.28}$$

where $\omega_j \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $c_j > 0$ *for all* $j \in \mathcal{J}$, *and* $\{\tilde{L}_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ *is a set of operators in* $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ *with the properties:*

1 $\{\tilde{L}_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}} = \{\tilde{L}_j^*\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$

2 $\{\tilde{L}_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ *consists of eigenvectors of the modular operator* Δ_σ *with*

$$\Delta_\sigma(\tilde{L}_j) = \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j} \tilde{L}_j. \tag{2.29}$$

3 $\frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{H})} \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{L}_j^* \tilde{L}_k) = \delta_{k,j}$ *for all* $j, k \in \mathcal{J}$

4 $\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{L}_j) = 0$ *for all* $j \in \mathcal{J}$

Finally for any $j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$

$$c_j = c_{j'} \quad \text{when } \tilde{L}_j^* = \tilde{L}_{j'}. \tag{2.30}$$

Conversely, given any faithful state σ, *any set* $\{\tilde{L}_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ *satisfying the above four items for some* $\{\omega_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *and any set* $\{c_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ *of positive numbers satisfying the symmetry condition Equation* (2.30), *the operator* $\mathcal{L}$ *given by Equation* (2.27) *is the generator of a quantum Markov semigroup* $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *which is self-adjoint with respect to* $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$.

Remark 3. The operators $L_j \equiv \tilde{L}_j \sqrt{c_j} \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/4}$ in Equation (2.27) play the role of the Lindblad operators, and the Hamiltonian of the system is equal to 0.

Dirichlet forms and the quantum de Bruijn identity

The $2-$*Dirichlet form* of a quantum Markov semigroup is a very useful object which completely characterizes the semigroup. It is defined as follows: For a semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with generator $\mathcal{L}$, invariant state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\varphi,2}(f, g) := -\langle f, \mathcal{L}(g) \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}. \tag{2.31}$$

In the context of quantum logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, one can similarly define p-Dirichlet forms for $p > 1$ and $\varphi = \varphi_{1/2}$ (see [36]). In particular, the 1-Dirichlet form, first defined in [24] as the limit $p \to 1$ of the family of p-Dirichlet forms, is particularly useful:

$$\mathcal{E}_1(f, f) := -\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr} \left(\Gamma_\sigma(\mathcal{L}(f)) (\log(\Gamma_\sigma(f)) - \log \sigma) \right), \tag{2.32}$$

$\mathcal{E}_1(f, f)$ can be related to the so-called *entropy production* associated to the semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ [45]. This name is due to the following identity.

Lemma 1 (quantum de Bruijn identity)**.** *Given a semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with generator $\mathcal{L}$, symmetric with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1/2,\sigma}$, for a given faithful state σ,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} D(\Lambda_{t*}(\rho)\|\sigma) = -2\mathcal{E}_1(\Gamma_\sigma^{-1} \circ \Lambda_{t*}(\rho), \Gamma_\sigma^{-1} \circ \Lambda_{t*}(\rho)). \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. Define $\rho_t := \Lambda_{t*}(\rho)$. By Theorem 3 of [45],

$$\frac{dD(\rho_t\|\sigma)}{dt} = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{L}_*(\rho_t)(\log \rho_t - \log \sigma)).$$

The result follows from (2.12). □

The quantity on the right hand side of Equation (2.33) is called *entropy production*:

$$EP_\sigma(\rho) := 2\mathcal{E}_1(\Gamma_\sigma^{-1}(\rho), \Gamma_\sigma^{-1}(\rho)). \tag{2.34}$$

In analogy with the classical case, we also denote it by $I_\sigma(\rho)$, and refer to it as the *quantum Fisher information* of ρ with respect to the sate σ.

In the case of a semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ whose generator is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{s,\sigma}$, for a given faithful state σ and $s \in [0,1]$, the Dirichlet form can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_{s,2}(f,g) \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\varphi_s,2}(f,g) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \mathrm{e}^{(1/2-s)\omega_j} \langle \partial_j f, \partial_j g \rangle_s, \tag{2.35}$$

where

$$\partial_j f := [\tilde{L}_j, f]. \tag{2.36}$$

The passage from Equation (2.31) to Equation (2.35) can be understood as some sort of noncommutative integration by parts, where the generator $\mathcal{L}$ plays the role of the Laplacian, and each ∂_i the role of the partial derivative "along the direction i". By analogy with the classical case of Markov processes defined on finite or continuous state spaces, the operators ∂_i defined above are called *derivations*. Classically, such an integration by parts enables one to map the problem of finding the rates of convergence of an ergodic Markov process with invariant measure μ to the study of the concentration of measure of bounded or Lipschitz functions of a given random variable X of law μ. The derivations defined in Equation (2.36), which directly originate from the generator of a semigroup whose expression is given in Equation (2.27), allow for the construction of a quantum differential calculus, initiated in [7, 8], which is analogous to the classical case. This in turn implies the possibility of the study of concentration inequalities in the noncommutative framework. Given an operator $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, its noncommutative *gradient* is defined as:

$$\nabla U := (\partial_1 U, ..., \partial_{\mathcal{J}} U), \quad U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{2.37}$$

Similarly, given a vector $\mathbf{A} \equiv (A_1, ..., A_{|\mathcal{J}|}) \in \bigoplus_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the *divergence* of $\mathbf{A}$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j [A_j, \tilde{L}_j^*]. \tag{2.38}$$

For $\vec{\omega} := (\omega_1, ..., \omega_{|\mathcal{J}|})$, define the linear operator $[\rho]_{\vec{\omega}}$ on $\bigoplus_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ through

$$[\rho]_{\vec{\omega}}\mathbf{A} := ([\rho]_{\omega_1} A_1, ..., [\rho]_{\omega_{|\mathcal{J}|}} A_{|\mathcal{J}|}), \qquad \mathbf{A} \equiv (A_1, ..., A_{|\mathcal{J}|}), \tag{2.39}$$

where for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$[\rho]_\omega = R_\rho \circ f_\omega(\Delta_\rho), \quad f_\omega(t) := \mathrm{e}^{\omega/2}\frac{t - \mathrm{e}^{-\omega}}{\log t + \omega}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.40}$$

Intuitively, $[\rho]_\omega$ is a noncommutative way of multiplying by ρ. The following result can be found in [8]:

Lemma 2 (see Lemma 5.8 of [8])**.** *For any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$[\rho]_\omega^{-1}(A) = \int_0^\infty (t + \mathrm{e}^{-\omega/2}\rho)^{-1} A (t + \mathrm{e}^{\omega/2}\rho)^{-1} dt. \tag{2.41}$$

$$[\rho]_\omega(A) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{e}^{\omega(1/2-s)} \rho^s A \rho^{1-s} ds. \tag{2.42}$$

We end this section by stating a very useful lemma:

Lemma 3. *[Chain rule identity, see [8] Lemma 5.5] For all $L \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and all $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$[L, \mathrm{e}^f] = \int_0^1 \mathrm{e}^{sf}\ [L, f]\ \mathrm{e}^{f(1-s)} ds. \tag{2.43}$$

2.5 Quantum Wasserstein distances

Classically, a useful measure of distance between two probability measures μ, ν defined on a metric space (M, d) is the so-called *Wasserstein distance* of order $p \geq 1$. It is defined as follows:

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu,\nu)} \left(\int_M d(x, y)^p d\pi(x, y) \right)^{1/p}, \tag{2.44}$$

where the infimum is taken over the set $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ of probability measures π on the Cartesian product $M \times M$ with marginals μ and ν. I contrast to the Kullback-Libler divergence, Wasserstein distances satisfy the properties of a distance, and therefore endow the set $\mathcal{P}(M)$ of probability measures on M with a metric. The cases $p = 1$ and $p = 2$ are of particular importance. For $p = 2$, it can be proved (under some technical assumptions) that $\mathcal{P}(M)$ can be turned into a Riemmanian manifold with associated Riemannian distance given by W_2. Moreover, W_2 can be re-expressed as the minimizer of a variational problem expressed in terms of a Markov evolution on the Manifold $\mathcal{P}(M)$ (see [49, 15, 44] for more details). This characterization of W_2 paved the way for a definition of a noncommutative generalization it by Carlen and Maas ([7, 8]). They defined a *noncommutative Wasserstein distance* $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$ as follows:

$$W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho, \sigma) := \inf_{\gamma(s)} \left\{ \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}} ds \right)^{1/2} \ : \ \gamma(0) = \rho, \ \ \gamma(1) = \sigma \right\} \tag{2.45}$$

where the infimum, taken over smooth paths $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, is achieved, and $g_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a modified version of the *Kubo-Mori-Bogoliubov Fisher information metric* on the set $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ seen as a manifold, for which a construction is given in Appendix A (see also [7, 8] for more details). The paths achieving the infimum, if they exist, are the minimizing geodesics with respect to the metric $g_{\mathcal{L}}$. The Wasserstein distance $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$ can be alternatively expressed as follows:

Lemma 4. *With the above notations, the Wasserstein distance between two faithful states ρ, σ is equal to the minimal length over the smooth paths joining ρ and σ:*

$$W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) = \inf_{\gamma(s)} \left\{ \int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}} ds : \ \gamma(0) = \rho, \ \gamma(1) = \sigma \right\}, \tag{2.46}$$

where the infimum is taken over the set of curves γ of constant speed, i.e. such that $s \mapsto \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}}$ is constant on $[0,1]$.

Proof. By the proof of Lemma 1.1.4 (b) of [2], for any smooth path $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, with $\gamma(0) = \rho$ and $\gamma(1) = \sigma$ there exists a path η with the same boundary conditions and constant speed, i.e. for any $s \in [0,1]$

$$\|\dot{\eta}(s)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\eta(s)}} = \int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(u)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(u)}} du.$$

Fix such a path γ. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $s \in [0,1]$

$$\|\dot{\eta}(s)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\eta(s)}} = \int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}} ds \leq \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}} ds \right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.47}$$

with equality if $\gamma = \eta$. The statement follows by taking the infimum over all smooth paths γ on the right hand side of (2.47). □

This definition for the quantum Wasserstein distance, $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$, is natural in the sense that the path $\gamma(t) := \rho_t$, which is a solution of the master equation

$$\dot{\rho}_t = \mathcal{L}_* \rho_t, \tag{2.48}$$

is *gradient flow* for the $D(.\|\sigma)$, where σ is the invariant state associated to $\mathcal{L}$. This means that $\mathcal{L}_*\rho = -\operatorname{grad}_{\mathcal{L}} D(\rho\|\sigma)$, where the gradient $\operatorname{grad}_{\mathcal{L}}$ of a differentiable functional $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as the unique element in the tangent space at ρ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(\gamma(t))\Big|_{t=0} = g_{\mathcal{L},\rho}(\dot{\gamma}, \operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathcal{L},\rho}} \mathcal{F}(\rho)) \tag{2.49}$$

for all smooth paths $\gamma(t)$ defined on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\gamma(0) = \rho$. In particular, for $\gamma(t) = \rho_t \equiv \Lambda_{t*}(\rho)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} D(\rho_t\|\sigma)\Big|_{t=0} = -g_{\mathcal{L},\rho}(\mathcal{L}_*(\rho), \mathcal{L}_*(\rho)) = -\|\mathcal{L}_*(\rho)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\rho}}. \tag{2.50}$$

The case $p = 1$ can also be generalized as follows. The classical Wasserstein distance W_1 has the following dual representation:

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\varphi:\, \|\varphi\|_{\text{lip}} \leq 1} \left\{ \int \varphi d\mu - \int \varphi d\nu \right\}, \tag{2.51}$$

where $\|\varphi\|_{\text{lip}}$ denotes the Lipschitz norm of the function φ. This representation is due to Kantorovich and Rubinstein [49], and for this reason is also called the *Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance*. This equivalent definition has been generalized to the noncommutative setting in [22] for tracial states. In the same spirit, given a quantum semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of the form of Equation (2.27), we define by analogy with the classical case a *differentiable operator* f to be a self-adjoint operator such that for any $j \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\sum_j c_j (\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}) \|\partial_j f\|_\infty^2 < \infty. \tag{2.52}$$

In this case, we define the norm

$$\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} := \left(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j (\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}) \|\partial_j f\|_\infty^2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.53}$$

Remark 4. An intuitive justification for our use of the notation $\|.\|_{\text{Lip}}$ is as follows: In the infinite dimensional case of the 1-mode quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (see [8]), $|\mathcal{J}| = 2$, and the derivations ∂_1 and ∂_2 are given by $[a^*, .]$ and $[a, .]$ respectively, where a, a^* represent the annihilation and the creation operators on the algebra of the canonical commutation relations. Moreover, $\omega_1 = -\beta$, $\omega_2 = \beta$ and $c_i = 1/2$, $i = 1, 2$, where β represents the inverse temperature. Therefore, for $f := \varphi(Q)$, where φ is a bounded differentiable function on $\mathbb{R}$, with derivative φ', and $Q := (a + a^*)/\sqrt{2}$ is the position operator:

$$\|\varphi(Q)\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{e}^{-\beta/2} + \mathrm{e}^{\beta/2}) \|\varphi'(Q)\|_\infty^2. \tag{2.54}$$

where we used the fact that $\|[a, \varphi(Q)]\|_\infty = \|[a^*, \varphi(Q)]\|_\infty = \varphi'(Q)/\sqrt{2}$. In the limit $\beta \to 0$ of infinite temperature, the semigroup reduces to the so-called quantum Brownian motion semigroup (see [10]), and its generator reduces to the classical Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}$ when applied to operators of the form $f = \varphi(Q)$. In this case,

$$\|\varphi(Q)\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|\varphi'(Q)\|_\infty = \|\varphi\|_{\text{lip}}, \tag{2.55}$$

Next we define the *noncommutative* 1-*Wasserstein distance* between two states ρ and σ associated to a semigroup with generator $\mathcal{L}$ of the form of Equation (2.27) to be

$$W_{1,\mathcal{L}}(\rho, \sigma) := \sup_{f:\, \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1} |\operatorname{Tr}(f(\rho - \sigma))|. \tag{2.56}$$

In the classical setting, a simple use of the Hölder inequality leads to the fact that

$$1 \leq p \leq q < \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad W_p \leq W_q. \tag{2.57}$$

The following lemma shows that this hierarchy is maintained in the quantum scenario:

Lemma 5. *For any $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$W_{1,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) \leq W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma), \tag{2.58}$$

Proof. The proof is inspired by the proof of Proposition 2.12 of [15]. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a smooth path $(\gamma(s))_{s\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\gamma(0) = \rho$, $\gamma(1) = \sigma$, and

$$\left(\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{V}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}\right)^{1/2} \leq W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) + \delta, \tag{2.59}$$

where for each $s \in [0,1]$, $\mathbf{V}(s) \equiv (V(s)_1, ..., V(s)_{|\mathcal{J}|})$ is related to $\gamma(s)$ through Equation (A.5). Hence, for any $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\operatorname{Tr}(f(\rho-\sigma))| &= \left|\operatorname{Tr}\left(f\int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds}\gamma(s)ds\right)\right| \\
&= \left|\int_0^1 \operatorname{Tr}\left(f\,\mathrm{div}([\gamma(s)]_{\vec{\omega}}\mathbf{V}(s))\right)\right| \\
&= \left|\int_0^1 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \langle \partial_j f, [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j} V(s)_j\rangle_{HS} ds\right| \\
&\leq \left(\int_0^1 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \langle \partial_j f, [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j}\partial_j f\rangle_{HS} ds\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \langle V(s)_j, [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j} V(s)_j\rangle_{HS} ds\right)^{1/2} \\
&= \left(\int_0^1 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \langle \partial_j f, [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j}\partial_j f\rangle_{HS} ds\right)^{1/2} (W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) + \delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.60}$$

where in the fourth line we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with respect to the inner product $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \int_0^1 \langle ., [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j} .\rangle_{HS} ds$. Now, for each $j \in \mathcal{J}$, and any $s \in [0,1]$,

$$[\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} R_{\gamma(s)} + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2} L_{\gamma(s)}. \tag{2.61}$$

This inequality follows from the fact that the Wasserstein distance $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$ falls in the class of quantum Fisher information metrics introduced by Petz in [42] (see also e.g. [28, 19, 41, 20, 46]). Indeed, from Equation (2.40), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(f^{-1}_{\omega_j})(\Delta_{\gamma(s)}) &= \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}\frac{\log \Delta_{\gamma(s)} + \omega_j}{\Delta_{\gamma(s)} - \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}} \\
&= \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}\frac{\log \Delta_{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\gamma(s)|\gamma(s)}}{\Delta_{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\gamma(s)|\gamma(s)} - 1} \\
&\equiv \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2} k^{\log}(\Delta_{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\gamma(s)|\gamma(s)}),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

where $k^{\log} : \mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto (t-1)^{-1}\log(t)$ is such that $-k^{\log}$ is operator monotone, $k^{\log}(t^{-1}) = tk^{\log}(t)$, and $k^{\log}(1) = 1$. Therefore, from Theorem 2.11 of [28], it follows that

$$R^{-1}_{\gamma(s)} k^{\log}(\Delta_{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\gamma(s)|\gamma(s)}) \geq (R_{\gamma(s)} + L_{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\gamma(s)})^{-1}. \tag{2.63}$$

The inequality (2.61) follows by substituting (2.62) into (2.63). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \partial_j f, [\gamma(s)]_{\omega_j} \partial_j f \rangle_{HS} &\leq \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} \operatorname{Tr}(\gamma(s)\partial_j f^* \partial_j f) + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2} \operatorname{Tr}(\partial_j f^* \gamma(s) \partial_j f) \\ &\leq (\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}) \|\partial_j f\|_\infty^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by Hölder's inequality. Substituting this result into (2.60), we end up with

$$|\operatorname{Tr}(f(\rho-\sigma))| \leq \|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}(W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma)+\delta) \leq W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma)+\delta,$$

since by assumption $\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \leq 1$. The result follows by taking the limit $\delta \to 0$, and optimizing the left hand side of the above inequality over all such f. □

3 Quantum functional- and Talagrand inequalities

In this section, we consider an ergodic quantum Markov semigroup $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with invariant state $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, whose generator is of the form given in Equation (2.27). Such a semigroup is said to satisfy the following:

1. A modified logarithmic Sobolev (or 1-log-Sobolev) inequality with constant $\alpha_1 > 0$ if for all $f \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\alpha_1 \operatorname{Ent}_{1,\sigma}(f) \leq \mathcal{E}_1(f,f), \tag{LS1(α_1)}$$

 or equivalently if for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$,

$$2\alpha_1 D(\rho\|\sigma) \leq EP_\sigma(\rho) = I_\sigma(\rho). \tag{3.1}$$

2. A 1-Talagrand inequality with constant $c_1 > 0$ if for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$

$$W_{1,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) \leq \sqrt{2c_1 D(\rho\|\sigma)}. \tag{T$_1$(c_1)}$$

3. A 2-Talagrand inequality with constant $c_2 > 0$ if for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$

$$W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) \leq \sqrt{2c_2 D(\rho\|\sigma)}. \tag{T$_2$(c_2)}$$

4. A Poincaré inequality with constant $\lambda > 0$, with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}$, where $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, if for all $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\operatorname{Tr}(\sigma f) = 0$,

$$\lambda \|f\|_{\varphi,\sigma}^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_{\varphi,2}(f,f). \tag{P(λ)}$$

Classically, it is proved that (LS1(α_1))⇒(T$_2$(c_2))⇒(P(λ)), for $\alpha_1 \leq 1/c_2 \leq \lambda$, as well as (T$_2$($c_2$))⇒(T$_1$($c_1$)) for $c_2 \geq c_1$. Moreover, (LS1(α_1)) and (T$_2$(c_2)) imply Gaussian concentration, whereas (P(λ)) only implies exponential concentration (see [49, 44, 15] and references therein). Here we state and prove the noncommutative analogues of these results. Note that the implication (LS1(α_1))⇒(P(λ)) for $\alpha_1 = \lambda$ was proved in [24] in the quantum framework for primitive semigroups which are symmetric with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1/2,\sigma}$. Finally, the implication (LS1(α_1))⇒(T$_2$(c_2)) was already proved in [7] is the particular case of the Fermionic Fokker-Planck equation.

Remark 5. If we assume σ non-degenerate and $\mathcal{L}$ to be self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$, we know from Theorem 1 that it is also self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\varphi,\sigma}$ for any $\varphi : (0,1) \to (0,1)$. Therefore $\mathcal{L}$ admits a spectral decomposition:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{L})} \lambda P_\lambda(\mathcal{L}), \tag{3.2}$$

However, since for each $t \geq 0$, $\Lambda_t := \mathrm{e}^{t\mathcal{L}}$, one can similarly write

$$\Lambda_t = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{L})} \mathrm{e}^{t\lambda} P_\lambda(\mathcal{L}). \tag{3.3}$$

In order for Λ_t to satisfy Equation (2.20), the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}$ need to all be non-positive, and the highest one $\lambda_0 = 0$ is associated to the eigenspace $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{I}$. Therefore, the inequality (P(λ)) holds for any $\lambda < \lambda_1$ and any $\varphi : (0,1) \to (0,1)$, where the so-called *spectral gap* λ_1 is nothing but the second (negative) highest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}$.

The following result, Theorem 3, is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.

Theorem 3. *If $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies the 2-Talagrand inequality ($T_2(c_2)$), then it satisfies the 1-Talagrand inequality ($T_1(c_1)$) with $c_1 = c_2$.*

The following result, namely that the modified log-Sobolev inequality (LS1(α_1)) implies the Talagrand inequality (T$_2$(c_2)) was first proven in the classical, continuous case by Otto and Villani in [38] (see also [5, 17] for alternative proofs, Theorem 7.5 of [15] for the classical, discrete case, and [7] for the case of the fermionic Fokker-Planck semigroup).

Theorem 4. *If $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies (LS1(α_1)), then ($T_2(c_2)$) holds with $c_2 = \alpha^{-1}$.*

Proof. Here we adapt the proof of [15] to the case of faithful quantum states. We first state and prove the following lemma:

Lemma 6. *Let $\rho, \tau \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$. Then for all $t > 0$, $\rho_t \equiv \Lambda_{t*}(\rho)$ satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dt} W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \tau) \leq \sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_t)}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. We proceed here similarly to the proof of Proposition 7.1 of [15]: Firstly, by the triangle inequality,

$$\frac{d}{dt} W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \tau) = \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{1}{s} (W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_{t+s}, \tau) - W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \tau)) \leq \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{1}{s} W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \rho_{t+s}), \tag{3.5}$$

Now, by Lemma 4,

$$W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \rho_{t+s}) = \inf_{\gamma(s)} \left\{ \int_0^1 \|\dot\gamma(u)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(u)}} du : \ \gamma(0) = \rho_t, \ \gamma(1) = \rho_{t+s} \right\}, \tag{3.6}$$

This implies by a change of variable $v = t + us$ that for any smooth curve γ such that $\gamma(t) = \rho_t$ and $\gamma(t+s) = \rho_{t+s}$,

$$W_{2.\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t, \rho_{t+s}) \leq \int_t^{t+s} \|\dot\gamma(v)\|_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(v)}} dv. \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, from Equation (2.50):

$$\|\dot{\rho}_t\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\rho_t}} = -\frac{d}{dt}D(\rho_t\|\sigma) = I_\sigma(\rho_t), \tag{3.8}$$

where the second identity holds by de Bruijn's identity (2.33). Hence, choosing $\gamma(v) = \rho_v$, and substituting into (3.5), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t,\tau) \leq \lim_{s\to 0}\frac{1}{s}\int_t^{t+s}\sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_v)}dv = \sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_t)}, \tag{3.9}$$

where the last equality holds since $t \to \sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_t)}$ is continuous. □

Fix $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, and set $\rho_t = \Lambda_{t*}(\rho)$. First note that as $t \to \infty$,

$$D(\rho_t\|\sigma) \to 0 \text{ and } W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\rho_t) \to W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) \tag{3.10}$$

Define now the function

$$F(t) := W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho_t,\rho) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha_1}D(\rho_t\|\sigma)}. \tag{3.11}$$

Obviously $F(0) = \sqrt{2D(\rho\|\sigma)/\alpha_1}$, and by Equation (3.10), $F(t) \to W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\sigma,\rho)$ as $t \to \infty$. Hence it is sufficient to prove that F is non-increasing. In order to do so, we only need to show that its derivative is non-positive. If $\rho_t \neq \sigma$, we know from Lemma 6 that

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(t) \leq \sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_t)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha_1}}\frac{\frac{d}{dt}D(\rho_t\|\sigma)}{2\sqrt{D(\rho_t\|\sigma)}} = \sqrt{I_\sigma(\rho_t)} - \frac{I_\sigma(\rho_t)}{\sqrt{2\alpha_1 D(\rho_t\|\sigma)}} \leq 0. \tag{3.12}$$

where we used Equation (LS1(α_1)) in the last inequality. If $\rho_t = \sigma$, then the relation also holds true, since this implies that $\rho_r = \sigma$ for all $r \geq t$. □

In [38] it was also proved that, in the classical, continuous case, the 2-Talagrand inequality implies the Poincaré inequality. In the discrete setting, this was proved in Proposition 7.6 of [15]. The result below extends these results to the quantum regime.

Theorem 5. *If $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies ($T_2(c_2)$), then ($P(\lambda)$) holds with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1/2,\sigma}$, with $\lambda = (c_2\ \kappa_{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$, where $\kappa_{\mathcal{L}} = \|[\sigma]_{\omega_j} \circ [\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j}\|_{\infty\to\infty}$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = 0$, and for some ε small enough, define $f^\varepsilon := \mathbb{I} + \varepsilon f > 0$. Then, define the completely positive, trace-preserving map Ξ_σ through the following equation: for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\Xi_\sigma(A) := \int_0^\infty \frac{\sigma^{1/2}}{t+\sigma}A\frac{\sigma^{1/2}}{t+\sigma}dt \tag{3.13}$$

In order to get the result we will need the following two technical lemmas:

Lemma 7. *With the notations of Equation* (2.27)*,*

$$\tilde{L}_j(t+\sigma)^{-1} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1}}{1+t\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1}}\tilde{L}_j \tag{3.14}$$

$$(t+\sigma)^{-1}\tilde{L}_j = \tilde{L}_j\frac{\sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}}{1+t\sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}}. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. We first prove Equation (3.14):

$$\tilde{L}_j(t+\sigma)^{-1} = \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1}\tilde{L}_j(t+\sigma)(t+\sigma)^{-1} - t\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1}\tilde{L}_j(t+\sigma)^{-1}, \tag{3.16}$$

where we used that $\tilde{L}_j$ is an eigenvector of Δ_σ with associated eigenvalue $\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}$. Therefore,

$$(1 + t\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1})\tilde{L}_j(t+\sigma)^{-1} = \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma^{-1}\tilde{L}_j \tag{3.17}$$

and the result follows. Similarly for Equation (3.15),

$$(t+\sigma)^{-1}\tilde{L}_j = (t+\sigma)^{-1}(t+\sigma)\tilde{L}_j\sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j} - (t+\sigma)^{-1}t\tilde{L}_j\sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}. \tag{3.18}$$

The result again follows by rearranging the terms above. □

Lemma 8.

$$\partial_j(\Xi_\sigma(f)) = [\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j} \circ \Gamma_\sigma \circ \partial_j f. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. Start from the left hand side of Equation (3.19),

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_j(\Xi_\sigma(f)) = {} & \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}\sigma^{1/2}\tilde{L}_j\int_0^\infty (t+\sigma)^{-1}f(t+\sigma)^{-1}\sigma^{1/2}dt \\ & - \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}\sigma^{1/2}\int_0^\infty (t+\sigma)^{-1}f(t+\sigma)^{-1}\tilde{L}_j\sigma^{1/2}dt\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Let us first consider the first term on the right hand side of Equation (3.20). By Equation (3.14) it is equal to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}\sigma}{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\sigma + t}\sigma^{1/2}\tilde{L}_j f\sigma^{1/2}(t+\sigma)^{-1}dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}\sigma + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}u}\Gamma_\sigma(\tilde{L}_j f)\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}}{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}u + \sigma}du \tag{3.21}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}\sigma + u}\Gamma_\sigma(\tilde{L}_j f)\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}}{u + \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}\sigma}\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j}du \tag{3.22}$$

$$= [\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j} \circ \Gamma_\sigma(\tilde{L}_j f), \tag{3.23}$$

where we made the change of variable $\mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}u = t$ on the first line, and used Lemma 2 in the last line. Similarly, using (3.15), the second term on the right hand side of Equation (3.20) is equal to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}}{t+\sigma}\Gamma_\sigma(f\tilde{L}_j)\frac{1}{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j}\sigma + t}dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{u + \mathrm{e}^{\omega_j/2}\sigma}\Gamma_\sigma(f\tilde{L}_j)\frac{1}{\mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}\sigma + u}du \tag{3.24}$$

$$= [\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j}(\Gamma_\sigma(f\tilde{L}_j)), \tag{3.25}$$

where we made the change of variable $t = \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}u$. Hence Equation (3.19) follows. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5. Start by the following:

$$\langle f, \Xi(f)\rangle_{1/2,\sigma} = \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_\sigma(f)\Xi_\sigma(f)) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^{1/2}\Xi_\sigma(f)\sigma^{1/2}(f^\varepsilon - \mathbb{I})) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathrm{Tr}(\Xi_\sigma(f)(\sigma^{1/2}f^\varepsilon\sigma^{1/2} - \sigma)). \tag{3.26}$$

For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a smooth path $(\gamma^\varepsilon(s))_{s\in[0,1]}$, with associated vector field $(\mathbf{V}^\varepsilon(s))_{s\in[0,1]}$ (cf. Equation (A.2)), with respect to the Wasserstein distance $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$, interpolating between $\rho^\varepsilon := \Gamma_\sigma(f^\varepsilon)$ and σ, and such that

$$\left(\int_0^1 \|\dot\gamma^\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma^\varepsilon(s)}}\right)^{1/2} \leq W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho^\varepsilon,\sigma) + \delta$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, \Xi(f)\rangle_{1/2,\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Xi_\sigma(f)\int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds}\gamma^\varepsilon(s)ds\right) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\Xi_\sigma(f)\int_0^1 \operatorname{div}([\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\vec\omega}\mathbf{V}^\varepsilon(s))ds\right)\\
&= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^1 \sum_j c_j\langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\omega_j}(V^\varepsilon(s))_j\rangle_{HS}ds\\
&\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(\sum_j c_j\int_0^1 \langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\omega_j}\circ\partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f)\rangle_{HS}ds\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_0^1 \|\mathbf{V}^\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{L},\gamma^\varepsilon(s)}ds\right)^{1/2}\\
&= \left(\sum_j c_j\int_0^1 \langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\omega_j}\circ\partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f)\rangle_{HS}ds\right)^{1/2}\frac{W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho^\varepsilon,\sigma)+\delta}{\varepsilon}\\
&\leq \left(\sum_j c_j\int_0^1 \langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\omega_j}\circ\partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f)\rangle_{HS}ds\right)^{1/2}\frac{\sqrt{2c_2D(\rho^\varepsilon\|\sigma)}+\delta}{\varepsilon},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

where the first inequality comes from a use of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with respect to the inner product $\sum_j\langle .\ , \int_0^1[\gamma^\varepsilon(s)]_{\omega_j}ds\ .\rangle_{HS}$. As $\varepsilon\to 0$, the term in brackets in (3.27) converges to

$$\sum_j c_j\langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\sigma]_{\omega_j}\circ\partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f)\rangle_{HS} = \sum_j c_j\langle \partial_j\Xi_\sigma(f), [\sigma]_{\omega_j}\circ[\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j}\circ\Gamma_\sigma\circ\partial_j f\rangle_{HS} \tag{3.28}$$

$$\leq \sup_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\|[\sigma]_{\omega_j}\circ[\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j}\|_{\infty\to\infty}\ \mathcal{E}_{1/2,2}(f,\Xi_\sigma(f)). \tag{3.29}$$

Denote $\kappa_{\mathcal{L}} := \|[\sigma]_{\omega_j}\circ[\sigma]^{-1}_{-\omega_j}\|_{\infty\to\infty}$. As $\delta > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily, we can now take the limit $\delta\to 0$. Moreover, following the approach of the proof of Theorem 16 of [24], one can prove that

$$D(\rho^\varepsilon\|\sigma)/\varepsilon^2 \to \frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{Tr}(\Gamma_\sigma(f)\ \Xi_\sigma(f))) \tag{3.30}$$

Substituting into (3.27), we get

$$\frac{1}{c_2\ \kappa_{\mathcal{L}}}\langle f,\Xi_\sigma(f)\rangle_{1/2,\sigma} \leq \mathcal{E}_{1/2,2}(f,\Xi_\sigma(f)). \tag{3.31}$$

This is exactly the form that was derived at the end of the proof of theorem 16 of [24] which lead to the Poincaré inequality. □

4 Quantum concentration inequalities

The following theorem is a generalisation of the classical results of [18] (see also the review [33]). It states that the Poincaré inequality implies exponential concentration.

Theorem 6. *Let σ be a non-degenerate, faithful state, and $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be an ergodic quantum Markov semigroup on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ whose generator $\mathcal{L}$ is self adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$. If $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies (P(λ)), for a given function $\varphi : (0,1) \to (0,1)$, then for any bounded self-adjoint differentiable operator f,*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f - \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f))) \leq 3\mathrm{e}^{-r\sqrt{\lambda}/(\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} C_{f,\lambda})}. \tag{4.1}$$

where $\|.\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}$ is defined in Equation (2.53), and $C_{f,\lambda} \equiv \frac{\mathrm{e}^{2\sqrt{\lambda}\|f\|_\infty/\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}}-1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}\|f\|_\infty/\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}}$.

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = 0$. For $\theta \geq 0$, and $f \neq 0$ self-adjoint differentiable, and let

$$\Phi_f(\theta) := \mathrm{Tr}\left(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\theta f}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

By Remark 5, one can reduce to the case of $\varphi = \varphi_1$ without loss of generality. In this case, the Poincaré inequality P(λ) applied to $\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2} - \mathrm{Tr}\,\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}$ can be written as:

$$\lambda\, (\Phi_f(\theta) - \Phi_f(\theta/2)^2) \leq \mathcal{E}_{1,2}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}, \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right). \tag{4.3}$$

But, as by assumption $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is self-adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$, one can rewrite $\mathcal{E}_{1,2}$ as follows (cf. Equation (2.35)):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{1,2}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}, \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right) &= \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2}\, \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma \left(\partial_j \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right)^* \partial_j \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right] \\ &= \frac{\theta^2}{4} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} \iint_{[0,1]^2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\frac{(1-s)\theta f}{2}} (\partial_j f)^* \mathrm{e}^{\frac{s\theta f}{2}} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{u\theta f}{2}} \partial_j f \mathrm{e}^{\frac{(1-u)\theta f}{2}}\right) du ds.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where we used Lemma 3 in the second line. Moreover, for each $u, s \in [0,1]$, the trace in Equation (4.4) is equal, by cyclicity, to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right)^* \left(\mathrm{e}^{\frac{-s\theta f}{2}} (\partial_j f)^* \mathrm{e}^{\frac{(s+u)\theta f}{2}} \partial_j f \mathrm{e}^{\frac{-u\theta f}{2}}\right)\right] \\ &\quad \leq \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right) \mathrm{e}^{\theta(s+u)\|f\|_\infty} \|(\partial_j f)^*\|_\infty \|\partial_j f\|_\infty \\ &\quad = \Phi_f(\theta) \mathrm{e}^{\theta(s+u)\|f\|_\infty} \|\partial_j f\|_\infty^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder inequality as well as the submultiplicativity of the operator norm in the second line. Substituting into (4.4), we thus get:

$$\mathcal{E}_{1,2}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}, \mathrm{e}^{\theta f/2}\right) \leq \frac{\Phi_f(\theta)}{4\|f\|_\infty^2} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \mathrm{e}^{-\omega_j/2} \|\partial_j f\|_\infty^2 \left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta\|f\|_\infty} - 1\right)^2 \tag{4.5}$$

$$\leq \|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}^2\, \Phi_f(\theta) \frac{\left(\mathrm{e}^{\theta\|f\|_\infty} - 1\right)^2}{4\|f\|_\infty^2}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\|.\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}$ is defined in Equation (2.53). However, for any $0 \leq \theta < 2\sqrt{\lambda}/\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{e}^{\theta\|f\|_\infty} - 1}{\theta\|f\|_\infty} \leq \frac{\mathrm{e}^{2\sqrt{\lambda}\|f\|_\infty/\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}} - 1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}\|f\|_\infty/\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}} \equiv C_{f,\lambda} > 1. \tag{4.7}$$

Hence, substituting into Equation (4.3):

$$\lambda\ (\Phi_f(\theta) - \Phi_f(\theta/2)^2) \leq \theta^2\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{Lip}}\ C^2_{f,\lambda}\ \Phi_f(\theta)/4. \tag{4.8}$$

This last inequality implies that

$$\Phi_f(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \theta^2\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{Lip}}\ C^2_{f,\lambda}/(4\lambda)}\Phi_f(\theta/2)^2, \tag{4.9}$$

for every $\theta < 2\sqrt{\lambda}/(C_{f,\lambda}\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}})$. A simple iteration procedure yields

$$\Phi_f(\theta) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{1 - \theta^2\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{Lip}}\ C^2_{f,\lambda}/(4^{k+1}\lambda)}\right)^{2^k}\Phi_f(\theta/2^n)^{2^n}. \tag{4.10}$$

Note that $\Phi_f(\theta) = 1 + \theta\,\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2)$, and we have assumed that $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = 0$. Thus letting $n \to \infty$:

$$\Phi_f(\theta) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{1 - \theta^2\|f\|^2_{\mathrm{Lip}}\ C^2_{f,\lambda}/(4^{k+1}\lambda)}\right)^{2^k}. \tag{4.11}$$

Set $\theta = \sqrt{\lambda}/(\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}C_{f,\lambda})$, then the right hand side is a universal constant contained between e and 3. So we proved that

$$\Phi_f\left(\sqrt{\lambda}/(\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}C_{f,\lambda})\right) \leq 3. \tag{4.12}$$

Now by functional calculus, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta > 0$:

$$\mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f) = \mathbf{1}_{[\exp(\theta r),\infty)}(\exp(\theta f)) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\theta r}\mathrm{e}^{\theta f}. \tag{4.13}$$

This leads to the following Markov-type inequality:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma\mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f)) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-r\theta}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma\exp(\theta f)) = \mathrm{e}^{-r\theta}\Phi_f(\theta). \tag{4.14}$$

Therefore

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma\mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f)) \leq 3\mathrm{e}^{-r\sqrt{\lambda}/(\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}C_{f,\lambda})}. \tag{4.15}$$

□

The first proof that the Talagrand inequality of order 1 implies Gaussian concentration is due to Marton [31]. The following theorem is a quantum generalisation of Bobkov-Götze's proof [4] which relies on the variational representations of the 1 Wasserstein distance (see also Theorem 36 of [44] or Proposition 7.7 of [15]):

Theorem 7. *Let σ be a faithful state, and $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be an ergodic quantum Markov semigroup on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ whose generator $\mathcal{L}$ is self adjoint with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{1,\sigma}$. If $(\Lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies Equation* $(\mathrm{T}_1(c_1))$*, the following Gaussian concentration inequality holds: for any self-adjoint operator f such that $\Delta_\sigma^{-1/2} f$ is differentiable,*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f - \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f))) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r^2}{2\|\Delta_\sigma^{-1/2} f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}^2 c_1}}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. Here we follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 36 of [44]. From $(\mathrm{T}_1(c_1))$, we know that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, and any differentiable operator g such that $\|g\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \leq 1$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma g) = 0$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\rho g) \leq W_{1,\mathcal{L}}(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{2c_1 D(\rho\|\sigma)}. \tag{4.17}$$

Next, from the fact that

$$\inf_{t>0} \left(\frac{a}{t} + \frac{bt}{2} \right) = \sqrt{2ab} \tag{4.18}$$

for any $a, b \geq 0$, we see that any such g must satisfy

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\rho g) \leq \frac{1}{t} D(\rho\|\sigma) + \frac{c_1 t}{2}, \quad \forall t > 0. \tag{4.19}$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\rho g) - \frac{c_1 t^2}{2} \leq D(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \widehat{D}(\rho\|\sigma), \quad \forall t > 0, \tag{4.20}$$

where we have used (2.19), and $\widehat{D}(\rho\|\sigma)$ is the maximal divergence defined though Equation (2.18). Define $\rho := \sigma^{1/2} \mathrm{e}^{tf} \sigma^{1/2} / (\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{tf}))$, where f is a self-adjoint operator to be specified later. Hence Equation (4.20) becomes

$$t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\rho g) - \frac{c_1 t^2}{2} \leq t \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{tf} f)}{\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{tf})} - \log(\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{tf})) \tag{4.21}$$

Now for $f = \Delta_\sigma^{1/2}(g)$, the last expression further simplifies into

$$-\frac{c_1 t^2}{2} \leq -\log(\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{tf})) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi_f(\theta) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathrm{e}^{\theta f}) \leq \mathrm{e}^{c_1 \theta^2/2}. \tag{4.22}$$

Note that the quantity $\Phi_f(\theta)$ was also used in the proof of Theorem 6. As in (4.14):

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f)) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-r\theta}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \exp(\theta f)) = \mathrm{e}^{-r\theta} \Phi_f(\theta) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-r\theta} \mathrm{e}^{c_1 \theta^2/2}. \tag{4.23}$$

Optimizing over all $\theta > 0$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f)) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r^2}{2c_1}}. \tag{4.24}$$

In order to achieve this bound we assumed that $g = \Delta_\sigma^{-1/2}(f) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is such that $\|g\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \leq 1$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma g) = 0$. This implies that $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f) = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \Delta_\sigma^{1/2}(g)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma g) = 0$. Therefore, up to a rescaling we proved that for any self-adjoint, differentiable operator f,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma \mathbf{1}_{[r,\infty)}(f - \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma f))) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2\|\Delta_\sigma^{-1/2} f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}^2 c_1} \right). \tag{4.25}$$

□

5 Summary and open questions

In this paper we derived concentration inequalities for invariant states of a class of quantum Markov semigroups. More precisely, we define quantum versions ($\mathrm{T}_1(c_1)$),($\mathrm{T}_2(c_2)$) of the classical Talagrand inequalities T1 and T2 (cf. (Tp)). These inequalities involve two quantum generalizations of the classical Wasserstein distances W_1 and W_2 (cf. (2.44)), the latter defined by Carlen and Maas [8], and the former being defined in this paper. We then proved that these inequalities are related to quantum functional inequalities, namely the modified log Sobolev inequality and Poincaré inequality, as well as concentration of quantum states, analogously to their classical counterparts (see Figure 2).

It would be interesting to address the following open questions: Firstly, the classical concentrations of Lipschitz functions on metric probability spaces have been shown to be equivalent to some concentration of measure inequalities (see e.g. Theorem 3.4.1 of [44]). In [37], Osborne and Winter derived a quantum analogue of a particular concentration of measure inequality, namely the Talagrand concentration inequality [27], employing the notion of a quantum Hamming distance. Since our quantum concentration results are quantum extensions of concentration for Lipschitz functions, it would be interesting to see how they relate to theirs. Moreover, we expect our results to be generalizable to infinite dimensions and, for example, provide concentration of quantum Gaussian thermal states, thus extending the well-known concentration of Gaussian random vectors. Finally, it would be interesting to find applications of our quantum concentration results in the fields of quantum information theory and quantum computing.

References

[1] R. Alicki. On the detailed balance condition for non-hamiltonian systems. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 10(2):249–258, 1976.

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[3] S. Beigi and C. King. Hypercontractivity and the logarithmic sobolev inequality for the completely bounded norm. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(1):015206, 2016.

[4] S. Bobkov and F. Götze. Exponential integrability and transportation cost related to logarithmic sobolev inequalities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 163(1):1 – 28, 1999.

[5] S. G. Bobkov, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. Hypercontractivity of hamilton–jacobi equations. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 80(7):669 – 696, 2001.

[6] R. Carbone and E. Sasso. Hypercontractivity for a quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 140(3-4):505–522, 2008.

[7] E. A. Carlen and J. Maas. An analog of the 2-wasserstein metric in non-commutative probability under which the fermionic fokker–planck equation is gradient flow for the entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(3):887–926, 2014.

[8] E. A. Carlen and J. Maas. Gradient flow and entropy inequalities for quantum markov semigroups with detailed balance. *arXiv:1609.01254*, 2016.

[9] E. Christensen and D. E. Evans. Cohomology of operator algebras and quantum dynamical semigroups. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-20(2):358–368, 1979.

[10] F. Cipriani, F. Fagnola, and J. M. Lindsay. Spectral Analysis and Feller Property for Quantum Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Semigroups. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 210(1):85–105, 2000.

[11] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[12] T. Cubitt, M. Kastoryano, A. Montanaro, and K. Temme. Quantum reverse hypercontractivity. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 56(10), 2015.

[13] P. Delgosha and S. Beigi. Impossibility of local state transformation via hypercontractivity. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 332(1):449–476, 2014.

[14] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste. Logarithmic sobolev inequalities for finite markov chains. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 6(3):695–750, 08 1996.

[15] M. Erbar and J. Maas. Ricci curvature of finite markov chains via convexity of the entropy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 206(3):997–1038, 2012.

[16] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan. Complete positive dynamical semigroups of N-level systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 17(1976):821, 1976.

[17] N. Gozlan. A characterization of dimension free concentration in terms of transportation inequalities. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(6):2480–2498, 11 2009.

[18] M. Gromov and V. D. Milman. A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 105(4):843–854, 1983.

[19] F. Hiai and H. Kosaki. Means for matrices and comparison of their norms. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 48(3):899–936, 1999.

[20] F. Hiai, H. Kosaki, D. Petz, and M. B. Ruskai. Families of completely positive maps associated with monotone metrics. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 439(7):1749–1791, 2013.

[21] F. Hiai and M. Mosonyi. Different quantum f-divergences and the reversibility of quantum operations. *arXiv:1604.03089*, 2016.

[22] M. Junge and Q. Zeng. Noncommutative martingale deviation and poincaré type inequalities with applications. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 161(3):449–507, 2015.

[23] M. Kastoryano and K. Temme. Non-commutative Nash inequalities. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(1), 2016.

[24] M. J. Kastoryano and K. Temme. Quantum logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and rapid mixing. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(5), 2013.

[25] A. Kossakowski, A. Frigerio, V. Gorini, and M. Verri. Quantum detailed balance and KMS condition. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 57(2):97–110, 1977.

[26] M. Ledoux. On talagrand's deviation inequalities for product measures. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 1:63–87, 1997.

[27] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[28] A. Lesniewski and M. B. Ruskai. Monotone riemannian metrics and relative entropy on noncommutative probability spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 40(11):5702–5724, 1999.

[29] G. Lindblad. Brownian motion of a quantum harmonic oscillator. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 10(3):393–406, 1976.

[30] G. Lindblad. On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 48(2):119–130, 1976.

[31] K. Marton. Bounding d-distance by informational divergence: A method to prove measure concentration. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(2):857–866, 1996.

[32] K. Matsumoto. A new quantum version of f-divergence. *arXiv:1311.4722*, 2013.

[33] E. Milman. On the role of convexity in isoperimetry,spectral gap and concentration. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 177(1):1–43, 2009.

[34] A. Montanaro. Some applications of hypercontractive inequalities in quantum information theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 53(12):1–18, 2012.

[35] A. Müller-Hermes and D. S. Franca. Sandwiched Rényi convergence for quantum evolutions. *arXiv:1607.00041*, 2016.

[36] R. Olkiewicz and B. Zegarlinski. Hypercontractivity in noncommutative Lp spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 161(1):246 – 285, 1999.

[37] T. Osborne and A. Winter. A quantum generalisation of Talagrand's inequality. `https://tjoresearchnotes.wordpress.com/2009/02/13/`,.

[38] F. Otto and C. Villani. Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 173(2):361 – 400, 2000.

[39] V. Paulsen. *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, volume 78. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[40] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[41] D. Perez-Garcia, M. M. Wolf, D. Petz, and M. B. Ruskai. Contractivity of positive and trace-preserving maps under l p norms. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 47(8):083506, 2006.

[42] D. Petz. Monotone metrics on matrix spaces. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 244:81–96, 1996.

[43] D. Petz and M. Ruskai. Contraction of generalized relative entropy under stochastic mappings on matrices. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics*, 1(1):83–89, 1 1998.

[44] M. Raginsky and I. Sason. Concentration of Measure Inequalities in Information Theory, Communications, and Coding. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 10(1-2):1–247, 2014.

[45] H. Spohn. Entropy production for quantum dynamical semigroups. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 19(5):1227–1230, 1978.

[46] K. Temme, M. J. Kastoryano, M. Ruskai, M. M. Wolf, and F. Verstraete. The χ 2-divergence and mixing times of quantum markov processes. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 51(12):122201, 2010.

[47] K. Temme, M. J. Kastoryano, M. B. Ruskai, M. M. Wolf, and F. Verstraete. The CHi2-divergence and mixing times of quantum Markov processes. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 51(12), 2010.

[48] K. Temme, F. Pastawski, and M. J. Kastoryano. Hypercontractivity of quasi-free quantum semigroups. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(40):405303, 2014.

[49] C. Villani. *Optimal transport, old and new*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

A Construction of the quantum 2-Wasserstein distance

In this appendix, we recall the construction of the quantum 2-Wasserstein distance of [8]. For a quantum Markov semigroup with generator $\mathcal{L}$ of the form of Equation (2.27), Carlen and Maas defined in [8] a smooth Riemmanian structure on $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ that is determined by $\mathcal{L}$. Let $\gamma(s)$, $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ be a differential path in $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and denote $\rho := \gamma(0)$. Then $\mathrm{Tr}(\dot{\gamma}(0)) = \frac{d}{ds} \mid_{s=0} \mathrm{Tr}(\gamma(s)) = 0$. This implies that there is an affine subspace of $\bigoplus_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of elements $\mathbf{A} := (A_1, \ldots, A_{|\mathcal{J}|})$ for which

$$\dot{\gamma}(0) = \mathrm{div}(\mathbf{A}). \tag{A.1}$$

Define $\mathbf{V} := -[\rho]^{-1}_{\vec{\omega}}(\mathbf{A})$. Then Equation (A.1) becomes

$$\dot{\gamma}(0) + \mathrm{div}([\rho]_{\vec{\omega}}\mathbf{V}) = 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Define the following inner product $\langle .,. \rangle_{\mathcal{L},\rho}$ on $\bigoplus_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\langle \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{V} \rangle_{\mathcal{L},\rho} := \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} c_j \langle W_j, [\rho]_{\omega_j} V_j \rangle_{HS}, \tag{A.3}$$

where $\langle A, B \rangle_{HS} := \mathrm{Tr}(A^* B)$ denotes the usual Hilbert Schmidt inner product on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Carlen and Maas proved that there is a unique vector field $\mathbf{V} \in \bigoplus_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of the form $\mathbf{V} = \nabla U$, where $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is traceless and self-adjoint, for which the following noncommutative continuity equation holds:

$$\dot{\gamma}(0) = -\operatorname{div}([\rho]_{\vec{\omega}} \nabla U). \tag{A.4}$$

Hence, looking upon $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ as a manifold, for each $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$, we can identify the tangent space T_ρ at ρ with the set of gradient vector fields $\{\nabla U : \ U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),\ U = U^*\}$ through the correspondence provided by the continuity equation (A.4). Defining the metric $g_{\mathcal{L}}$ through the relation

$$\|\dot{\gamma}(0)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\rho(0)}} := \|\mathbf{V}\|^2_{\mathcal{L},\rho(0)}, \tag{A.5}$$

this endows the manifold $\mathcal{D}_+(\mathcal{H})$ with a smooth Riemmanian structure. In this framework, Carlen and Maas then defined the *modified noncommutative Wasserstein distance* $W_{2,\mathcal{L}}$ to be the energy associated to the metric $g_{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e.:

$$W_{2,\mathcal{L}}(\rho,\sigma) := \inf_{\gamma(s)} \left\{ \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|^2_{g_{\mathcal{L},\gamma(s)}} ds \right)^{1/2} \ : \ \gamma(0) = \rho, \ \ \gamma(1) = \sigma \right\}. \tag{A.6}$$